

to interfere with the institution in the States it may rest undisturbed, and then "outside slave States it can have no valid legal existence." In the slave States we can begin to do with it, only to subvert to its advantage. This is the doctrine of both the dominant parties. There is not so much difference between the slavery question, substantially, as there outwardly to exist.

It is so great a wrong to permit slavery to exist as the Republican party allege, and if it is so then fraught with the millions of such are ever inseparable from oppression, the wickedness is not diminished when some to be, sustained by State authority, we can make slavery right in Kansas or the territories, say, the Republicans, but they think it may be right in Virginia, if not, they admit this indirectly, when they admit that they are willing to do with the States, they admit that right and wrong slavery is made—not established principles—and can be per or overturned by future, law or decree, without regard to their intrinsic nature, for those that truth is eternal, and allows is among the metaphysical, eternal things liable to be affected by surrounding influences. If it not does so do the Democrats? They also say slavery is wrong in Kansas, right in Carolina. Does this position say more do slaveholders desire? Any that is right in Kansas and wrong in Carolina, it is wrong in Virginia. It looks like a full round. The free States have been giving territory after territory to slavery, and pretended friends of freedom are even to principle that slavery is right. "The whole race have recognized and accepted slavery," States, says Mr. Clegg. "This position, with the leading parties of the free republic, does not go to show that nothing about the question is good in slavery, in the free States, is much doing at all, or worth doing.











W A L T E R

\_\_\_\_\_